

Atty Docket No. NOKIA.5002US

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 25 and 26 have been amended by this Amendment. Claims 28-31 have been added by this Amendment.

The Office Action dated March 16, 2005 objected to the abstract of the disclosure and to claims 6, 25, and 26. The Office Action rejected claims 25 and 27 as being unpatentable in view of the prior art. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 1-24.

**Objections**

The objection to the abstract of the disclosure is set forth in part 1 on page 2 of the Office Action. The Abstract is objected to because of undue length and the second paragraph. Applicants have amended the Abstract to overcome the objection. The objection to claims 6, 25 and 26 is set forth in part 2 on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the objection.

**Obviousness Rejection**

The grounds for the rejection of claims 25 and 27 is set forth in part 4 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action. The claims are rejected as being obvious in view of the embodiment including HLR 114 in Fig. 3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,457 issued to Silver et al (this embodiment hereinafter referred to simply as "Silver"). No other reference is cited in the rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because it fails to establish a prima facie case that a network element having each and every one of the combination of features recited in claim 25 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art from the cited reference. Applicants have also amended claim 25 and submit that it is allowable over the cited prior art in any event.

The rejection acknowledges that Silver does not include means for receiving a second routing inquiry from the first network element, but asserts that it would have been obvious to do so "to enable the first network element to establish connections to a plurality of destination mobile terminals located in the data network." Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed modification is only suggested with the benefit of the hindsight provided by this application. The rejection should be withdrawn because it fails to show where the prior art provides a suggestion or motivation for the proposed

Atty Docket No. NOKIA.5002US

modification of Silver.

Notwithstanding the above arguments, claim 25 has been amended to further recite that:

1) the second routing information query "relates to the called party" in order to make clear that it is not related to plural calls/mobile terminals; and

2) the means for forming a query message for sending to the user register is "in response to the second routing information query."

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Silver nor any of the cited references suggest a network element having these features as recited in amended claim 25.

#### New Claims

New independent claim 28 is substantially similar to allowed claim 1, but is directed to a network element rather than a method. New independent claim 31 is substantially similar to allowed claim 14, but is directed to a network element rather than a method. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 28-31 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 14.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to the claims fees for additional claims 28-31, and any other fees necessary for the consideration of the Amendment, to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 10-0100 (Dkt. No. NOKIA.5002US).

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Bauer, Registration No. 34,487  
Lackebach Siegel, LLP  
One Chase Road  
Scarsdale, NY 10583  
Tel.: 914-723-4300  
Fax.: 914-723-4301